Application N0: 09/750,494 Attorney Docket No. AX-001-US Friedman et al.

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are currently pending, all of which have been rejected. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, and 10 are amended by this amendment.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview conducted on September 13, 2004. Although no agreement was reached as to the claims, the following matters were discussed:

- Mason reference (in particular figure 2, element 318; and paragraphs 29-31);
- Office Action dated August 13, 2004 (in particular, the rejection under 35 USC §102(e));
- Claim 1 of the present application.

Turning to the claims, claims 1-3 are objected to due to certain informalities identified in the office action. The informalities are due to a typographical error that is corrected by the amendment herein to claim 1 to delete the word "of" from the "means for comparing" element. In addition to the informalities found by the Examiner, Applicants have identified certain other typographical errors. In particular, in claims 5 and 10 the word "vendor" was inadvertently plural, and in claim 9 "a" was inadvertently used instead of "an" in front of "existing." These typographical errors are corrected by this amendment.

Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 on the grounds that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Again this is due to a typographical error. The term "the steps of" was inadvertently included in the preamble of claim 9. This typographical error is corrected by the amendment herein to the preamble of claim 9.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mason (US 2001/0051918). Claims 1, 4, and 9 are amended to more clearly point out and distinctly claim the relationship between the vendor and consumer. Mason does not teach the relationship as recited in any of the claims of the present application.

Application N0: 09/750,494 Attorney Docket No. AX-001-US Friedman et al.

The Applicant notes that the deficiencies in the Mason reference were discussed during ht the above-referenced telephonic interview. In particular, the Mason fails to teach or suggest data input means for receiving the telecommunications bills *provided from a vendor to a consumer* or transmitting the deprovision requests and the billing disputes to the vendor as recited in claim 1. Further, Mason fails to teach or suggest extracting data corresponding to billing item components, billing item rates and billing item quantities from the telecommunication bills as recited in claims 4 and 9. Finally, Mason fails to teach or suggest determining erroneous billing item rates in the telecommunication bills by comparing the billing item rates in the telecommunication bills to rate data representative of rates that should have been charged to the consumer as recited in claim 4.

In sum, Mason, as described in figure 2 (element 318) and paragraphs 29-31, relates to internal auditing by an e-billing company where an online invoice is compared to the original paper invoice. Mason fails to teach or suggest the relationship between the telecommunications consumer and vendor where information possessed by the consumer is used to analyze bills as recited in the claims as currently presented.

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable, and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Application N0: 09/750,494 Attorney Docket No. AX-001-US Friedman et al.

Please note that the undersigned attorney has changed correspondence address and telephone number. A change of address request for the attorney's customer number has been submitted.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: March 17, 2005

Mitchell Rosenfeld Reg. No: 36,258

Correspondence Address: Rosenfeld Law Corporation 2165 Filbert Street San Francisco, CA 94123 Customer No. 31955 (415) 928-3853